

cessions too it was possible to arrive at the compromise known as the treaty of Ryswick. Macaulay casually mentions the defection of the Duke of Savoy, but does not realise its importance or appreciate its bearing on the contest.¹ Hence he represents the concessions as entirely on the side of Louis ² and so makes the treaty more of a triumph for William than it really was.

To the period which elapsed between the treaty of Ryswick in August 1697 and William's death in March 1702 Ranke devotes the whole of his twenty-first book. Macaulay's narrative practically ends in April 1700.

It is possible to compare the accounts of the two partition treaties given by the two historians, but on the preparations for the war of the Spanish Succession, which Ranke terms William's * political masterpiece *, Macaulay's unfinished history is silent. Anyone who studies the estimate of William's character and his place in history with which Ranke concludes his narrative of the reign will find William's greatness explained and demonstrated as generously as any disciple of Macaulay could desire. The man is judged sympathetically, without extenuating his faults, the statesman justly praised because both his difficulties and his achievements are exactly appreciated.³ But Ranke's portrait of William is cold beside Macaulay's. The two historians

once met. Macaulay had reviewed Ranke's
Popes in 1840,
and three years later, when Ranke visited
England, Mac-
aulay was asked to meet him. Charles
Greville described
the meeting in his Diary.

I went prepared to listen to some first-rate
literary talk
between such luminaries as Ranke and
Macaulay, but there
never was a greater failure. The
professor, a vivacious

¹ VI, 2637-8 (aorii).

^a VI, 2712-16 (xxii).

^{3v}. 298.